

The Office Action alleges that Rienhoff teaches how a user gains access to a secured area of a site after clicking on a link that can be received though an e-mail. The Office Action summarily concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rienhoff with Kim in order to "restrict access to secure content". These assertions are incorrect for at least the following reasons.

The conclusory statement that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the alleged teachings of Rienhoff with the Kim system in order to restrict access to secure content fails to recognize that Kim already restricts access to secure content. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the alleged teachings of Rienhoff with Kim as asserted by the Office Action.

The Examiner responds that, in the Examiner's opinion, Kim's design does not let users have access to the workflow system (secured areas) prior to the receipt of the e-mail embedded with a link. This response apparently concedes the premise of Applicants' argument that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the alleged teachings of Rienhoff with Kim because Kim already "restricts access to secure content." Applicants maintain that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to how any object lacking in Kim would be achieved with a reasonable expectation of success based on the alleged teachings of Rienhoff.

Further, contrary to the assertion of the Office Action, Rienhoff does not teach, nor can it reasonably be considered to have suggested, the relied upon features. For example, the allegedly corresponding e-mail in Rienhoff may direct a user to a secure area of a website, but "access" to the secured area of the website is only gained by logging on with, for example, the log-in name and password established in step 750 (see paragraphs [0106] and [0113] of Rienhoff). Thus, the allegedly corresponding e-mail in Rienhoff does not provide a recipient

who does not have access to the workflow system with an access to an associated process of the workflow system, as recited, for example in claim 1.

The Examiner responds that Rienhoff allegedly does not require a login when accessing the secured area. The Examiner asserts that a secondary login setup is available, but is optional in Rienhoff. The Office Action refers to paragraph [0112] of Rienhoff in support of this assertion. However, the Examiner misinterprets the disclosure of Rienhoff with respect to these features.

Rienhoff states that "in some embodiments, the user may be given, or requested to establish, an additional login name and/or password to permit them access to the secured area" (emphasis added). The Examiner interprets this to mean that access to a secured area of a site does not require a login as asserted, but is, rather, accessible via a link. However, paragraph [0113] clarifies that, in step 780, the user logs into the secured area of the website. The user may login with the login name and password established in step 750. Alternatively, if the user established a login name and password in step 776, the user may login with the log in name and password established in step 776. Thus, the language of paragraph [0112] clearly means that what is "optional" is whether an additional login name and/or password will be established. Step 780, actually logging in to the secure area, with some login name and password, is not optional. Rienhoff teaches that a user will login to establish access to the secured area of the website either by the login name and password established in step 750, or the login name and password established in step 776.

As such, the allegedly corresponding e-mail in Rienhoff does not provide a recipient who does not have to access to the workflow system with an access to an associated process of the workflow system, as recited, for example, in claim 1.

With regard to claims 4, 5, 13 and 14, the Office Action asserts that Kim teaches randomly or pseudo-randomly generating the network address. This assertion is incorrect.

Kim does not address the relevant network addresses being generated. The Office Action apparently relies on a section in Kim that deals with generating an electronic signature key as teaching the generation of network address. This assertion is incorrect. The generating of the electronic signature key described in Kim does not correspond to generating a network address.

Regarding claims 8, 9, 19 and 20, the Office Action concedes that Kim does not teach embedding multiple links within a single e-mail. The Office Action relies on Official Notice that is well known in the art that a plurality of links can be embedded in an e-mail for the purpose of sending multiple links without using multiple messages. However, as detailed in the July 13, 2006 Amendment, the November 8, 2006 personal interview with the Examiner, and the November 16 Amendment, such a modification of Kim would impermissibly alter Kim's method of operation and render it unsuitable for its intended purpose. Specifically, Kim teaches sending decision makers individual e-mails, specific to certain documents, with individual random keys. As such, careful control of the sequence of approval is achieved (see section 3.3 of Kim). Incorporating multiple links to various stages of the workflow process of Kim, with all of the corresponding random keys required by Kim, would defeat this purpose, rendering the invention of Kim unsuitable for its intended purpose.

The Office Action responds that "no alteration and methods of operation is required for embedding multiple links versus one link, within an e-mail." This analysis does not meaningfully address Applicants' argument that Kim's method of operation involves sending decision makers individual e-mails, specific to certain documents, with individual random keys. Including multiple links within a single e-mail would clearly alter this method of operation. Additionally, the Examiner does not address the separate argument that such a modification would render Kim unsatisfactory for its intended purpose (see MPEP §2143.01

(V)). Applicants maintain that the asserted modification of Kim, to include multiple links within a single e-mail, would not have been obvious for at least these reasons.

Regarding claim 25, the Office Action asserts that Kim teaches excluding generating network addresses that have been embedded in previous e-mail messages created by the system that have not yet been accessed. The Office Action relies on page 2, second column, lines 25-40 of Kim as teaching such a feature. In the Response to Arguments section, the Office Action asserts that because Kim teaches that data within an e-mail, including the URL, can be encrypted to prevent it from being exposed, this means that the URL within each e-mail is "unique." This assertion is incorrect and does not address the relevant features of claim 25.

For example, the fact that information may be encrypted for transmission, and decrypted for use, does not mean that URLs within each e-mail are unique. For example, if the same URL were sent to several users via encryption, even though each message might contain different encrypted data, the URL may be the same.

Moreover, this does not correspond to excluding generated network addresses that have previously been embedded in any previous e-mail messages created by the system that have not yet been accessed. The feature of claim 25 allows for network addresses that have been accessed to be used again. There is no teaching or suggestion in the applied references of excluding generated network addresses that have previously been embedded in any previous e-mail messages created by the system that have not yet been accessed.

The Examiner maintains, in the Response to Arguments section, that the URL within each e-mail being unique is considered to correspond to excluding generated network addresses that have previously been embedded in any previous e-mail messages created by the system that have not yet been accessed. Kim does not teach excluding and does not allow for the reuse of network addresses that have been accessed. Any statistical "uniqueness"

achieved by Kim does not reasonably correspond to specifically excluding any previously generated network addresses, much less those that have previously been embedded in any previous e-mail messages created by the system that have not yet been accessed. Likewise, merely encrypting a URL within an e-mail does not correspond to excluding generated network addresses.

For at least the above reasons, the applied references do not teach, nor can they reasonably be considered to have suggested, the combination of features positively recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 21. Further, claims 2-9, 11-20, 22 and 25 are also neither taught, nor would they have been suggested, by the applied references for at least the respective dependence of these claims, directly or indirectly, on an allowable base claim as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdraw of the rejections of claims 1-22 and 25 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-22 and 25 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

James E. Golladay, II
Registration No. 58,182

JAO:JEG/clf

Date: January 18, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 24-0037